UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,841	12/22/2005	Yukio Miyairi	126400	3189
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 04/28/200 RIDGE. PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	MAYEKAR, KISHOR		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/561,841	MIYAIRI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kishor Mayekar	1795			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 M	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r.	-vaminer			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/06 &03/08.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the continuing data on page 1 is missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitation "plate-like" is confusing as to the difference between "plate-like" and "plate". And the recitations "generating plasma" and "application of voltage" in the last three lines are confusing as whether "plasma" and voltage" are the same as that recited in the claim preamble or different.

In claim 2, the same is applied to claim 1 to the recitation "plate-like". The recitation "a basic unit electrode" is confusing as to its correlation with the recited unit

electrode of claim 1. The recitation "as an external shape of the basic unit electrode" is confusing as whether the recited external shape is the same shape recited earlier or different. Further, the claim is confusing as whether the recited structures are part of the plasma generating electrode of claim 1.

In claim 3 and its depending claim 4, the same is applied to claim 2 as whether the recited structures are part of the plasma generating electrode of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Li et al. (USD 6,979,892 B2). Li's invention is directed to a laminated co-fired sandwiched element for non-thermal plasma reactor. Li discloses a plasma reactor comprising a plasma generating electrode comprising all the structures as claimed (Fig. 26; c. 10, 1. 57-62; c. 1, 1. 16-18 and c. 11, 1. 9-10).

As to the subject matter of each of claim 5, Li discloses it in Fig. 5.

7. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li '892. Li is applied as above but silent on the subject matter of each of claims 6-9. The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li's teachings because the selection of the opening percentage, the thickness of the unit electrode, the width of the protrusion and the distance between adjacent protrusions would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 1795

8. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li '892 in view of Nelson et al. (US 6,821,493 B2). The difference between Li as applied above and the instant claims are the subject matter recited in each of the instant claims. Nelson teaches in a non-thermal plasma reactor the limitations (Figs. 6-8). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li's teachings as shown by Nelson because the selection of any of known equivalent methods of preparing a multi-cell plasma generating electrode would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

Application/Control Number: 10/561,841 Page 6

Art Unit: 1795

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN

USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kishor Mayekar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795